

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 215 934

SO 014 011

AUTHOR Falk, Richard
TITLE Normative Initiatives and Demilitarization: A Third System Approach.
INSTITUTION Institute for World Order, New York, N.Y.
SPONS AGENCY World Order Models Project.
REPORT NO ISBN-0-911646-11-3; WOMP-WP-13
PUB DATE 82
NOTE 24p.
AVAILABLE FROM Institute for World Order, 777 UN Plaza, New York, NY 10017 (\$2.00, 5-25 copies, \$1.50).
EDRS PRICE MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS *Activism; Citizen Participation; *Disarmament; *Global Approach; International Relations; *Peace; Political Attitudes; Social Action; *World Affairs; World Problems
IDENTIFIERS *World Order

ABSTRACT

This paper explores and identifies initiatives in the struggle against militarization. It is one of a series of working papers commissioned by the World Order Models Project in its effort to stimulate research, education, dialogue, and political action aimed at contributing to a movement for a just world order. Taking into account the political structures and restraints of different polities, the author examines normative initiatives that challenge the root assumptions of militarization and that can be linked to actual social forces working for principled demilitarization. For purposes of clarification, three systems of political action can be distinguished: the First System - the state and its support infrastructure; the Second System - the United Nations and regional international institutes; and the Third System - represented by people acting individually and collectively through voluntary institutions. The author points to the primacy of the Third System. He argues that, at the present time, the First System is generally supportive of the underlying logic of militarization. The Second System, being a dependency of the First System, is generally unable to implement demilitarization initiatives. Only the Third System is consistently able to sustain normative initiatives of consequence to demilitarization. Normative initiatives relevant to demilitarization undertaken in the Third System can aid in mobilizing effective opposition to militarization in all three systems by altering the normative effective climate, thereby producing new "creative space" for political innovation. Finally, the author provides examples of the most promising Third System normative initiatives at the global, regional, state, and individual levels. (Author/RM)

 * Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
 * from the original document. *

ED215934

**U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)**

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☒ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

Normative Initiatives and Demilitarization: A Third System Approach

RICHARD FALK

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS
MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY
HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Stephen
Maikowski

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

50 014 011

**WORLD ORDER MODELS PROJECT
WORKING PAPER NUMBER THIRTEEN**

1982

©Institute for World Order, Inc., 777 United Nations Plaza,
New York, New York, 10017, U.S.A. 1982
ISBN 0-911646-11-3

This paper is one in a series of working papers commissioned by the World Order Models Project in its effort to stimulate research, education, dialogue and political action aimed at contributing to a movement for a just world order. The WOMP paper series deals with the major global problems facing humanity today within an analytic and normative framework guided by the concepts and values of peace, economic well-being, social justice, and ecological balance. Like other work in WOMP, the series gives appropriate consideration to the necessity and feasibility of structural transformation of today's fragmented world for the resolution of these problems and the achievement of just world order results.

We invite interested individuals throughout the globe to respond to this and other papers in the series, either directly to the author or to the WOMP directors. Where appropriate, the responses and critiques will be published in *Alternatives: A Journal of World Policy*.

WORLD ORDER MODELS PROJECT

Centre for the Study of Developing Societies (Delhi, India)

Department of Peace and Conflict Resolution,
Lund University (Lund, Sweden)

Institute for World Order (New York, N.Y., U.S.A.)

Synergic Developments Associated to
Fundacion Bariloche (Bariloche, Argentina)

World Order Studies Project (Tokyo, Japan)

Directors: Saul Mendlovitz, Yoshikazu Sakamoto

NORMATIVE INITIATIVES AND DEMILITARIZATION: A THIRD SYSTEM APPROACH

Richard FALK†

This paper explores and identifies "creative space" in the struggle against militarization. Taking into account the political structures and restraints of different polities, the author examines normative initiatives that challenge the root assumptions of militarization and that can be linked to actual social forces working for principled demilitarization. The author points to the primacy of the Third System in this effort. He argues, that, at the present time, the First System (the state system and its support infrastructure) is generally supportive of the underlying logic of militarization, that the Second System (the UN and regional international institutes) being a dependency of the First System is gen-

erally unable to implement demilitarization initiatives, and that only the Third System (represented by people acting individually and collectively through voluntary institutions) is consistently able to sustain normative initiatives of consequence to demilitarization. Normative initiatives relevant to demilitarization undertaken in the Third System can aid in mobilizing effective opposition to militarization in all three systems by altering the normative climate, thereby producing new "creative space" for political innovation. Finally, the author provides examples of the most promising Third System normative initiatives at the global, regional, sovereign state and individual levels.

I. Notes on Perspective

The tension between a militarized global system and a goal of demilitarization establishes the context for this inquiry. The global dynamic of militarization continues to prevail, incurring serious economic, social, political, and cultural costs, as well as generating a spiral of danger that could end in catastrophe for the peoples of the globe. Militarization is, in part, a byproduct of the fragmented organizational structure of the state system in which each polity defines its minimum security by reference to the military capabilities required to secure vital interests, especially the internal security of governing elites and classes and the integrity of its territory, but also the resources needed to keep

†Center of International Studies, Princeton University

a given economy and polity viable. Militarization is also related to the hierarchical structures by which powerful states exert varying degrees of hegemony over weaker states.

By contrast, demilitarization implies a comprehensive restructuring of world order and international security. Demilitarization involves an assault on fragmentation and hierarchy, and hence entails, above all else, a shift away from violence to sustain the organized political life on the planet. What has to happen to permit this redirection of energy to occur? At this stage, the dynamics of and preconditions for demilitarization remain virtually unknown and largely unexplored. International political experience has been dominated by different forms and velocities of militarization.

Although bureaucratic structures are not monolithic, governments generally are overwhelmingly hostile to, and suspicious about, demilitarization as a principled process of transformation. Some governments may favor partial demilitarization so as to improve their relative position within the framework of a militarized world. Indeed, all governments favor the relative demilitarization of other governments except for those who are their allies or arms customers. Such *tactical demilitarization*, the essence of arms control as a perspective on the war system, involves tinkering with the geopolitical setting, making it marginally safer, cheaper, or more manageable. At best, arms control achieves temporary relief from the dangers and burdens of unregulated militarization; it may also involve an effort by military elites to concentrate spending on particular types of weaponry or to discourage rivals from specific arms development. *But tactical demilitarization, whatever its guise, offers no challenge by governments to the fundamental role of military power and violence or their linkage to the international structures of fragmentation and hierarchy.*

The focus here is upon *principled demilitarization* that sets as its goal the abolition of war and defense establishments, and conceives of its task as the initiation of a political process that moves toward that goal. Preconditions for achieving the goals of demilitarization are the substantial erosion of fragmentation and hierarchy in the present world order system. In their stead, demilitarization proposes the goals of *coherence and equality*, structures by which planetary concerns are protected by institutions of a global identity and relations among actors based upon mutuality and respect.

Given this outlook, it becomes crucial to identify the location of *creative space* for innovation within the world political system. In effect, demilitarization is a political process, that is, a struggle to carry out a radically revisionist program of a specific sort. As such, it is bound to encounter resistance from the main institutional actors of the state system and its prominent supportive organizations (including multinational corporations, international financial institutions and private banks). In this respect, even inter-

national institutions with idealistic mandates, such as the United Nations, should be understood primarily as extensions of the state system, being dependent on voluntary financial contributions from leading governments. The UN lacks even a fully autonomous enclave of territorial space outside the jurisdiction of sovereign states, and possesses no independent enforcement capabilities. Militarization is firmly entrenched, and because the technology of war evolves so rapidly with such disquieting potential, it is exceedingly difficult to gain any official support for principled demilitarization. This reality is made even more formidable because of the confusion caused by assimilating some aspects of tactical demilitarization into the overall militarization process itself by way of arms control, peace rhetoric and nominal statist support for human rights. Semantic confusion is inevitable, as antagonistic social forces accord lip service to the same values and goals. As a consequence, world opinion has grown skeptical about professions of faith in peace and justice.

The path to demilitarization is also blocked by the main traditions of opposition to militarism, which are themselves based on theoretical and practical reliance upon political violence. The widespread acceptance of armed struggle as an essential precondition to the pursuit of drastic reforms at the societal level illustrates the pervasiveness of militarization. Of course, not all oppositional politics is militarist in character. Important non-violent, anti-militarist movements exist, and have achieved some notable successes. Gandhi's movement against British colonial occupation of India, Martin Luther King Jr.'s movement against racial discrimination in the United States, the popular movement that overthrew the Shah of Iran, and the Polish workers' movement (Solidarity) are a few prominent examples. Unfortunately, none of these instances has altogether sustained its demilitarizing achievements, either embracing militarizing methods once a certain threshold of power was crossed or disintegrating under the militarist pressures of entrenched forces.

As an initial step in a demilitarization campaign, a determined effort is needed to cut through the mystifying language and refute the distorted claims of power-wielders. First, is the misleading contention that existing elites, even in the superpowers, would welcome a trustworthy path of demilitarization. Secondly, is the derivative claim that demilitarization is not feasible because of the specific qualities of the enemy, or because of the way the world is structured, or even because of the inherent characteristics of human nature. Thirdly, is the fatalistic belief that it is necessary, in the sense of being unavoidable, "to live with" militarization, even at the level of nuclear weaponry, and that all that can be done is to minimize risks and costs to the extent possible. Fourthly, is the view that constructive action should not attempt more than to contain the velocity and some wasteful or menacing features of the militarization process. Fifthly is the general claim that prudent militarization

as a permanent posture will succeed at least in preventing general nuclear warfare and will keep the peace among the advanced industrial countries. And sixthly, is the counter-claim that only oppositional militarism can displace and surmount the oppressive structures of entrenched militarism.

This ideological underpinning of militarization enjoys the overwhelming support of all elites in the North, including the Northeast or Soviet sphere of influence. Militarization also seems to be accepted, as well, although accompanied by varying degrees of distress, by the leadership of international institutions. A credible demilitarizing challenge, then, will have to come from the popular sector, perhaps activating certain currently subdued voices within prevailing structures of political power. On the ideological level, the challenge of principled demilitarization will have to be clear about its goals, its strategies, and its visions of the future. In essence, such an image of demilitarization implies moving toward the realization of a world order system in which collective violence is minimized, if not eliminated, in which economic well-being of all people is assured, social and political standards of justice realized, and ecological quality restored and protected. To attain these ends in a coherent form requires several decades of concerted effort, presupposes struggle, and implies the restructuring of power, wealth and authority at all levels of social organization. The vision of restructuring at least implies a diminished role for states in the dominant sector of world society: a selective destructuring of state power, combined with the emergence of carefully constrained central guidance capabilities to express the underlying unity of planetary life and to protect effectively the general human interest in a sustainable environment and an undiminished stock of renewable resources. At the same time, by destructuring state power, the underlying diversity of planetary life would also be assured, thereby accomplishing an entirely novel blend of centralization and decentralization in the world order system.

Thus, our starting point is the search for creative space in an atmosphere dominated by the dynamic of persisting, indeed intensifying, militarization. In this atmosphere any fundamental challenge is ignored if possible, and repressed as necessary. To mount a challenge at this stage is primarily a matter of political education, piercing through the pacifying mystique of militarization as an inevitable feature of the human condition. The setting is adverse, and yet there are some positive signs. For one thing, nuclear weapons have revealed the horror of war to a new extent and their spread to a variety of governments makes it seem increasingly unlikely to a growing number of moral and religious leaders that nuclear peace can be maintained indefinitely. Secondly, state leaders are increasingly faced with a series of non-military problems that they are unable to solve within the constraints of the present world order system, and their capability for effective and humane governance seems to be steadily declining. Thirdly, the diffusion of power by means of

decolonialization, by the spread of military and economic prowess, and by the growth of Third World solidarity has posed a threat to the established, Western controlled *hierarchical* arrangement of geopolitical relations in the world. Fourthly, the growth of interdependence—economically, ecologically, and culturally—has exposed the inadequacy of this *fragmented* and *adversary* structure of secular power and authority in the world. As a consequence of these four developments, the legitimacy of militarization is being eroded in the short run by the economic squeeze, in the longer run by its genocidal style of risk-taking. In effect, powerful social and historical forces are undermining militarization at its apparent point of maximum momentum, but this subversive process is slow, uncertain in its effects and non-linear in its path (there are numerous regressions with the possibility always present of a decisive regression by way of World War III).

Therefore, the active, explicit challenge of demilitarization requires a feeling for how, when and whether to intervene in the social/political dynamic surrounding the role of war, and more generally of political violence. Above all else, meeting this challenge requires clarity about non-creative or sterile space that reinforces the dynamic of militarization while pretending to oppose it. To expect institutions in the dominant sectors to shift to demilitarization by the serious espousal of genuine disarmament proposals is one familiar instance of meaningless gesture. Similarly, to suppose that arms control agreements will lead in the direction of disarmament is another venture in sterile space—although such agreements may be valuable as short-time managerial instruments, reinforcing tendencies toward prudent militarization. Furthermore, to put faith in the victories of progressive movements of resistance is to overlook the extent to which virtually *all* politics is encompassed by the framework of militarization, in thought as well as in action. To explore and identify creative space in the struggle against militarization is the purpose of this paper. The proposal of particular normative initiatives needs to take account of the political structure that exists in different regions and state polities. Under this framework of constraints, we seek those normative initiatives that both enhance *understanding* and promote *realization* of world order values.

II. Three Systems of Politics

Basic to this line of analysis is the primacy of *the third system* for the work of *principled demilitarization* given the present global political situation.

For purposes of clarification, the three systems of political action can be distinguished:

The First System. The system of power comprised by the governing structures

of territorial states; in short, the state system, including its supporting infrastructure of corporations, banks, media; a system that is hierarchical, fragmented, and in which war and violence are accepted as discretionary options for power-wielders and in which armies, weapons, police, and military doctrines play a crucial role within and among states.

The Second System. The system of power comprised by the United Nations, and to a lesser extent by regional international institutions; this extension of the First System enjoys a verbal mandate that remains nominal, a mere promise of substantial achievement; a system that is supposed to mitigate hierarchy and fragmentation; as well, it repudiates the discretionary option of states to make war or use force to advance their particular ends; states, as members, are the primary actors in Second System arenas.¹

The Third System. The system of power represented by people acting individually or collectively through social movements, voluntary institutions, associations, including churches and labor unions; a system oriented around challenging the domestic manifestation of militarization, and subject to regulation and repression by the First System on "law and order" grounds; the Third System is the main bearer of new values, demands, visions, although its proposals may be coopted or subverted to varying degrees by the First System, or even on occasion, by the Second.² Third System successes can often be jeopardized either by remilitarization (e.g. Khomeini's Iran) or by vulnerability to uncontained militarist remnants (e.g. Allende's Chile). Such opposed dangers pose the dilemma of violence for Third System approaches to fundamental social change.

The idea of *normative initiative* is one of changing the terms of permissible action, by placing a boundary, or at least an inhibition, on what is discretionary. The international law of war represents a normative initiative of the First System. The prohibition of force except for purposes of self-defense in the Charter of the United Nations is a normative initiative of the Second System. The campaign against torture conducted by Amnesty International is a normative initiative of the Third System.

In essence, the argument here is that as matters now stand the First System has been increasingly mobilized on behalf of the logic of militarization; this process has spread around the world by way of arms transfers, sales, and the development of indigenous war-making and repressive capabilities. The Northern sector of the First System has also relied upon militarization to maintain favorable aspects of *international hierarchy*, especially in relation to the Southern sector. Finally, governing structures in all sectors have embraced militarization to maintain *intranational hierarchy*, organized along class, ethnic, religious, and regional lines.

These generalizations stand up despite the concessions made by the First System to demands for demilitarization, especially in the aftermath of World

Wars I and II: for instance, the creation of the Second System (League of Nations superseded by the United Nations), the advocacy and proposal of general and complete disarmament, and the renunciation of war as an instrument of foreign policy by way of an international treaty (Pact of Paris, 1928).

The Second System is a creation and largely a dependency of the First System. Yet, it has a normative logic and even a limited institutional momentum of its own. The Charter of the United Nations establishes a tension between statism (sovereign equality) and supranationalism (global community activity). The normative mission of the United Nations ("...to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war...") is tantamount to a call for demilitarization. Yet, the Second System remains dependent upon the First System, although subject to varying orientations depending on shifting internal coalitions among member governments. The Security Council and the General Assembly are its most important organs. Membership consists of states represented by political appointees who act under instructions from their governments. The Security Council, alone empowered to make decisions binding on Members, even partially incorporates the hierarchical feature (in the name of "realism") of the First System in the form of Permanent Members enjoying a right of veto. Furthermore, the professional staff of the United Nations is financially dependent upon contributions made by member states, especially a few rich and powerful ones. And despite the promise of the Charter, no effort has been made to endow the United Nations with autonomous peacekeeping capabilities.¹

The capacity of the Second System for demilitarizing initiatives, then, is neutralized by its dependence on the First System; it is insufficiently autonomous to pose a structural threat to militarization. Nevertheless, the Second System has made some helpful contributions to demilitarization, especially through the General Assembly on North-South issues of hierarchy: support for decolonialization and national self-determination, for the new international economic order, for human rights, for the prohibition of nuclear weapons, and for environmental protection are notable in this regard. The General Assembly has also endorsed normative initiatives helpful and relevant to the struggle for demilitarization: the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, the Covenants of Human Rights, the Nuremberg Principles, and calls for a global effort in the area of disarmament.

These notable achievements have to be linked to social forces in the Third System, however, in order to transform behavior. Movements for national liberation and OPEC have implemented Second System normative initiatives with structural consequences, whereas endorsements of the Nuremberg Principles and prohibition of nuclear weapons have not had any impact, as yet, because they have not been connected with a political process capable of altering behavior. Their significance is mainly latent or potential, possibly

symbolic, as tools or catalysts available for the appropriate social movement. We can illustrate this question of potency by reference to the anti-apartheid campaign waged so vehemently in the Second System. The normative initiative represented by the so-called anti-apartheid norm means little by itself, until coupled to resistance struggles or intervention threats. Then, however, by shifting the balance of legitimacy to the anti-apartheid side, it alters the status of First System rules of the game in a significant manner, validating normally "illegal" anti-regime intervention and invalidating normally "legal" pro-regime intervention, or at least shifting perceptions of crucial First System actors on matters of validity.

The Second System can be directed toward a demilitarizing orientation by several developments:

- any evolution that accords its institutional elements greater autonomy, thereby making it more likely to lend weight to its natural mission which is to dismantle the war system, to put peace on a secure footing, to promote equality and dignity at the expense of hierarchy;

- a repudiation by critical First System actors of the militarizing path, thereby using the Second System as a strategic political arena;

- a growth of a Third System movement around the goals of demilitarization that regards the Second System as a strategic political arena;

- a broadening by Third World countries of their attack upon the adverse effects of the First System hierarchy to include its military dimensions. The importance of the Second System for demilitarization is therefore considerable, even if its role remains largely latent and symbolic, awaiting catalytic stimulus from without.

The Third System is segmented as a result of the degree of control exercised over political space by territorial governments that constitute the First System. There is no free space where people could promote demilitarization without interference from the First System. Indeed, the First System sets the rules of the game for the Third System. These rules are confusing because they are not uniform. The diversity reflects the different strategies of governance and dominant political ideologies that control the definitions of the rights of people within any given sovereign state. In theory, each government purports to represent and protect the overall interest of its people, yet it continues overwhelmingly to resist pressures for fair and representative governance by falling back upon the logic of militarization (that is, law and order, security through military strength and claims of emergency powers). Also, the First System overwhelmingly controls the dissemination of information and the educational process, assuring that the public is assaulted by militarizing propaganda from cradle to grave. Again the segmented character of the First System results in different degrees and forms of control.

As does the Second System, the Third System suffers from a lack of *auton-*

omy, thereby greatly restricting its role in promoting demilitarization. In overtly repressive polities, this pressure on the Third System is direct, as well as indirect as through propaganda. In more liberal polities, this pressure is mainly indirect, although the boundaries of dissent are policed; to date, First System actors have successfully relied upon various forms of mystification and pacification to obtain support for the policies of militarization from a large majority of the population.

There are, however, certain tendencies that are threatening the credibility of First System domination over the Third System. The potency of popular discontent has been evident throughout this entire historical period. The outcome of the Algerian and Indochina Wars of Independence suggested the limits of transnational First System military superiority. Gandhi's movement against colonial rule in India, the popular movement against the Shah's tyranny in Iran, and Solidarity's movement against hardline bureaucratic rule in Poland revealed the power of non-violent mass movements when highly mobilized and well-disciplined.

On the level of legitimacy, the First System has weakened its claim to unrestricted authority by acknowledging the validity of certain normative restraints: international law; United Nations; specifically, human rights, including the Nuremberg obligation. In the Soviet Union, for instance, dissenters have long invoked the human rights commitments formally made by the Soviet government as one basis of their attack upon certain features of domestic hierarchy; in 1980, Polish strikers insisted, among their other grievances, that the Polish government abide by conventions governing the rights of labor that had been formulated under the auspices of the International Labor Organization.

Because of the carnage of past wars and the danger of future wars, the First System is on the defensive. It concedes at a verbal level the legitimacy of demilitarization. This concession is reinforced by virtually universal moral and legal normative orders. This normative foundation provides solid footing for Third System activities, including challenges directed at the First System.

One formidable constraint on the Third System is the tendency of the popular sector to restrict itself to territorial goals, that is, to reform only the national governing process in specified ways. To the extent that Third System goals are directed against various expressions of *hierarchy* within the national polity, it is important to emphasize the linkages that exist to global hierarchical structures. Beyond this, and more difficult to convince Third System activists about, is the importance of overcoming on a global scale specific types of *fragmentation*. Those that tie a state into the path of militarization are of special relevance, exposing ordinary people to the hazards of nuclear and other types of war, as well as to the waste of previous resources through military expenditures and to a reliance upon military elites in the governing

process, thereby tending to erode the protection of human rights at home. As well, economic, ecological and cultural interdependence create a Third System stake in the emergence of global capabilities to protect the public good of the whole. In particular, there appears to be a shared human commitment, as a matter of species identity, in the avoidance of irreversible catastrophe by way of mass war, environmental decay, or depletion of natural resources. Furthermore, the popular sector has an interest in impartial limitation of territorial power through effective procedures for enforcing human rights, that is, on the balance assuring *autonomy vis-a-vis international patterns of hierarchy* and providing *global community protection vis-a-vis intranational patterns of hierarchy*. A Third System movement for demilitarization depends on the emergence of a planetary consciousness that is alive to the interlinked dimensions of militarization and understands that autonomous liberation on a national scale is only partially attainable and not fully sustainable without reinforcing transformations of the state and statism. A transnational series of Third System initiatives alive to the global dimension of militarization is the most hopeful prospect in the years ahead. Part of the process of encouraging such a development is within the realm of Third System normative dimensions where obvious interconnections exist between the domestic demand for reform and its dependence upon corresponding shifts in global policy.

Of particular importance are normative initiatives relevant to demilitarization that can be undertaken in the Third System; that is, initiatives that challenge the root assumptions of militarization by insisting upon certain norms of procedure and substance that rest upon some adequate moral legal foundation. For this reason, the movement to prohibit the use of threat or even the possession of nuclear weapons is of significance beyond the effort to constrain governmental discretion. The movement for European Nuclear Disarmament (END) is a most spectacular example of Third System potency in this domain. Demonstrations by hundreds of thousands, backed by the support of many grassroots peace groups and by established religious organizations, are altering the political climate within which First System security policy is determined for Western Europe, and beyond. Rumania, in particular, has been seeking to extend the demilitarizing initiatives of END to embrace Warsaw Pact as well as NATO countries. The intention of such initiatives is to mobilize effective opposition to militarization in all three systems by altering the normative climate. Such new climate would create new creative space within both the First and Second Systems enabling demilitarizing moves to win wider backing.

Normative initiatives are not the only important activities of the Third System with respect to demilitarization. The movement against nuclear power in the Third System Northwest is questioning domestic hierarchy in some critical respects. Its wider implications extend from a concern with safety of

the nuclear fuel cycle, to the safety of any nuclear activity, including those related to military purposes. Comparable issues of safety in mining plant operation, waste disposal, and transporting and safeguarding of fissionable materials exist in the military nuclear sector, and perhaps are even compounded by secrecy and the absence of public scrutiny. By discrediting nuclear power, the Third System will go a long way toward agitating Third System concern about nuclear weapons, and even about traditional (militarized) conceptions of national security, although the reverse dynamic is also possible—namely, that to reinforce the prohibition on weapons, other nuclear activities will also fall under an increased barrage of criticism. The anti-nuclear power movement, important as it is for demilitarization politics, nevertheless falls outside the main focus of this paper, since it is not an initiative whose dominant motivation is to establish or enforce a norm.

As is obvious, there are positive and negative feedback relations among the three systems. At present, the main strategy is to alter the orientations of First System leaders by building pressure directly upward from the Third System, as well as by way of the Second System. As segments of the First System shift toward a comprehensive demilitarization orientation, the political current of energy works its way back down via the Second System to other segments of the Third System, and then back up again to new segments of the First System. In this regard, it is necessary to view the three systems as interconnected and flowing parts of a unitary evolving global political order.

The political opportunities (and challenges) also cross system boundaries. It is easy to contemplate, for instance, the formation of a pro-demilitarization coalition joining activist social forces in the Third System Northwest, with the leaders of segments of the First System South, and with elements of the Second System. A global demilitarization movement, then, is likely to partake of all three systems to some extent.

III. Normative initiatives in the Third System and demilitarization

There are several reasons why normative initiatives are an attractive focus for demilitarization. For one thing, every government in the First System, no matter how repressive, acknowledges its accountability to moral/legal norms; hence, a universal basis for seeking adherence to these norms exists. This is especially important for Third System activity, as it is often constrained by boundaries of First System tolerance; that is, since the entire world (except for high seas and Antarctica) is divided into territorial states each Third System arena is governed to some degree by a First System actor.

Secondly, the ambiguity of authoritative norms, including the distinction

between what is forbidden and what ought to be forbidden, creates "space" for prescriptive politics in most First System settings. This ambiguity extends to questions of what is binding by reference to international law upon a particular First System actor (e.g. are the Nuremberg Principles binding because declared and endorsed by the General Assembly and affirmed by an array of international law experts?). The point is that Third System activists committed to demilitarization can act as if the Nuremberg Principles are binding, and thereby raise questions of accountability in many First and Second System settings.

Thirdly, a normative dimension for demilitarization emphasizes two possible grounds for an overall challenge: it vindicates the right of resistance against illegitimate political authority at the First System level and suggests the possibility that a comparable right of resistance should be postulated at the Second System level, that is, to the mode and manner by which global interests are protected.

The locus of normative concern in the Third System needs also to be explained. The First System is the principal source of authoritative norms because of its dominance of the international legal order, but it is unwilling and incapable of implementing those norms supportive of demilitarization (e.g. prohibitions on aggressive war, nuclear weapons, abuses of human rights). The Second System keeps these norms alive in the public imagination because its credibility depends on some expression of minimal concern about the dangers confronting human society; yet it is paralyzed politically as a result of its dependence on the First System. Hence, it is only among elements of the Third System that there is a clear commitment to the enforcement of demilitarization norms by securing First System adherence. Even in the Third System, misinformation, hostile propaganda, pacifications, intimidation, and reactionary priorities confuse most people about their real stake in demilitarization. Also, different First System settings condition Third System priorities and openings. Human rights concerns seem paramount for those First System settings where the domestic hierarchy is most oppressive. More global (Second System) concerns may be more permissible in these settings even if felt to be less vital, although any attempt to insist that one's own government take demilitarizing initiatives because of a normative obligation to do so is likely to encounter stiff opposition.

The problems facing the Third System are different in the North and South. The center of militarization is in the North, as divided between the Northwest (USA-dominated) and the Northeast (USSR-dominated). The liberal orientation of the governing process in the Northwest allows explicit concentration on the demilitarizing imperative of its own First System actors as a matter of first priority. Such a priority seems sensible both because the repressive features of the Northeast are generally resistant to external pressure and

because First System actors in the Northwest pretend to be already committed to demilitarization. This pretense can be exposed for what it is, partly by normative initiatives in the Third System Northwest (e.g. a demand for disarmament, an insistence on the illegality of nuclear weapons, a claim that the sort of threats to use nuclear weapons contained in strategic doctrine are themselves instances of "crimes against humanity"). This exposure can arouse public indignation, as well as demonstrate the need for imaginative normative initiatives that operate beyond the boundaries of conventional politics.

The ideological orientation of the governing process in the Northeast also has implications for the Third System. It creates a natural umbrella for demilitarizing concerns, although First System apologists in the Northeast blame the Northwest, that is, the main capitalist sector of the First System, for militarist tendencies in the world. Secrecy and control of information in the Northeast also makes it more difficult to mount useful Third System campaigns on demilitarizing themes, except as proposals by relatively isolated intellectual dissenters (e.g. Sakharov) whose impact seems to be largely transnational. Issues of human rights (domestic non-economic hierarchy) enjoy a manifest demilitarizing priority in the Third System Northeast—USSR and Eastern Europe. Such realities expose the absence of "creative space", and reveal a failure by First System actors to protect the human interests of their own citizenries. For the non-Soviet portion of the Third System Northeast, special questions of international hierarchy (that is, Soviet domination) are added to issues of intranational hierarchy. Struggling against these repressive features will not necessarily contribute directly to the global demilitarization process, except by opening up space in which the pursuit of normative concerns is accepted as legitimate activity for citizens.

In the South, the weight of militarization is partly felt in the North-South hierarchical structure, especially to the extent that the militarizing tendency is associated both with international dependency and intranational repressiveness. The Iranian Revolution against the Pahlavi dynasty illustrated a Third System movement of extraordinary force animated by opposition to these two interlocking aspects of hierarchy. The main normative element in the Iranian revolutionary process was the stress on human rights, including gestures of solidarity, especially in the Third System Northwest. It remains unclear what will be the eventual character of the Islamic Republic as a First System actor, but it seems probably both that its anti-dependency posture will have a short-term major demilitarizing significance (cancellation of arms purchases, refusal to supply oil beyond Iranian capital requirements, support for liberation movements) for Iran, although not necessarily for the region, and that its governing process will generate a new agenda of severe human rights concerns.

In general, the Third System in the South is concerned with opposing the continued hierarchy dominated by the North; the anti-neocolonial struggle goes on in the period of formal independence of the states in the South. To the extent that international hierarchy is linked with domestic hierarchy, as when outside actors from the North help keep a First System elite in power, then the struggle for human rights at home is also a struggle against the militarization of the planet as a structure. Unlike the North where the First System actors are the main agents and beneficiaries of militarization, in the South the First System actors are, at best, subordinate links in the system, having been to sharply varying degrees socialized into "the military habit." Indeed, acquisition of weapons, even nuclear weapons, in the South is ambiguous, as it can be partially viewed as a necessary step to achieve autonomy for a given state or region, and possibly to shock the North into some denuclearizing initiatives of its own.⁴ Partly for these reasons, normative initiatives emanating from the Third System of the South are directed mainly at First System actors in the North, thereby attributing responsibility for global militarization (e.g., normative demands to renounce nuclear weaponry and strategy) mainly to those few states, especially the two superpowers.

IV. Specific proposals

Which Third System normative initiatives have most promise when it comes to demilitarization remains to be considered. A long list could be compiled. What follows is illustrative and tactical, suggesting the kind of proposals that seem most appropriate and the ones that have the most promise.

Global scale

The most significant Third System normative initiative at the global system level may be the projection of credible images of a comprehensive demilitarization process. This effort needs to be centered in the Third System, consisting of various individuals and groups linked together by collaborative arrangements, perhaps with the informal backing of some progressive First System actors. It is normative to the extent that demilitarization is a way of specifying what is preferable, that is, what would be normative for the politics of the future. The academic foundations for such an outlook are being developed under various rubrics: world order studies, future studies, peace studies, utopography, macro-history, dialectics of the future, "soft" science fiction. Its essential feature is a conviction in the possibility and necessity of an encompassing transformation of the present orientation of First System elites so as to combat the increasingly pervasive militarization of the planet. What

is needed in the Third System is the dissemination of these images beyond the community of academic intellectuals in forms that are accessible to people in various circumstances of consciousness and literacy. Also necessary are a transnational consensus-building process around the issue of what demilitarization implies and reliance on various means to promote its goals in different areas, depending especially on First System constraints varying from country to country. Although image-forming is principally a Third System initiative, it would be helpful to have strategies for promoting demilitarization advocated from within the First and Second Systems.

The second area of normative initiative on a global scale would involve generating pressure for all varieties of denuclearization, especially in the military domain. On no issue is the global and human interest more evident than in the delegitimation of nuclear weaponry. Normative consensus would contribute to this result by placing a stigma upon reliance on nuclear weapons and strategy. Illustrative of such directions of initiative are the issuance of two non-governmental declarations, each informed by the ethos of denuclearization: the 1978 Delhi Declaration for a Just World⁶ and the 1980 Lisbon Declaration on Denuclearization for a Just World: the Failure of Non-Proliferation.⁶ Both documents, drafted and endorsed by concerned citizens from around the world, express in unambiguous terms their conviction that any threat or use of nuclear weapons would be a crime against humanity. The Delhi Declaration even insists that the mere possession of nuclear weapons is a crime against humanity; the Lisbon Declaration also regards possession as criminal but not until a time definite has been formally established by the joint initiative of non-nuclear states. The Third System consensus on the menace of nuclear weaponry is an important element in a global movement for denuclearization. A recent expression of the consensus can be found in the Rajgir Declaration in which Buddhist communities of Asia and individuals from many countries join to condemn nuclearism.⁷ In the Northwest, the struggle against nuclear power, as unsafe and authoritarian in implication, combines certain elements of resistance to *intranational hierarchy*—anti-democratic structures—with opposition to the war system as the fundamental expression of *international hierarchy*.

A third area for normative initiative concerns direct opposition to militarization tendencies. Here again the circumstances of a given national setting suggest the specific form of struggle. The domestic arenas of the two super-powers are obviously critical, both very different from one another. In the United States, movements against draft registration, opposition to specific weapons systems (MX, Trident), and opposition to specific arms transfers (e.g. to repressive regimes) and to increases in defense spending are important. In the Soviet Union, national security policy as such seems beyond citizen scrutiny, but calls for more consumer goods and denunciations by dissenters

of interventionary use of Soviet military power work in a demilitarizing direction. The basic demilitarizing imperative in the Soviet Union, however, remains the struggle for human rights, which is in its essence a demand for domestic demilitarization. If this struggle were to enjoy success, the demilitarizing effects would exert influence on the Soviet approach to international security.

Throughout the world, also, it would be helpful to promote the efficacy of non-violent approaches to conflict. India, with its rich Gandhian legacy, is especially situated, although not by its own recent defense policy, to gain a global hearing for non-violent politics. Academic efforts to discover and highlight non-violent, pacifist, and altruistic elements in the various great cultures of the world would help to convey the understanding, so needed at present, that non-violence has universal roots and many practical successes. To be serious about the abolition of war as a social institution implies putting something in the place of violence; necessarily then, images of non-violent polities of varying dimensions must be fed to the political imagination of peoples throughout the world seeking relief from a destiny of apocalyptic war.

Regional Scale

Regional enactments of global scale initiatives are obviously appropriate and, on occasion, timely. The recent surge of Third System efforts in Western Europe has been prompted by specific insensitive First System security policy, especially proposed provocative weapons deployments that seem to increase the prospect of "limited nuclear war" on a regional scale. Beyond this, regional and sub-regional efforts to decouple their security systems from the menace of war would be beneficial. In this regard, nuclear-free zones, non-alignment postures, intra-regional peacekeeping and disarmament moves, and general efforts to insulate Third World regions from superpower competition and ex-colonial intervention are beneficial moves in the appropriate direction.

Sovereign state scale

Normative initiatives directed at the governing process in sovereign states are of great importance at this stage of history. One important line of effort would be to restrict force structures and military doctrines to defensive conceptions of the use of military power. Admittedly, the defensive/offensive distinction is difficult to draw as so much depends on intention and context, yet the insistence that international force be used defensively, if at all, is vital

as the experience with private violence within states suggests. The struggle for governmental accountability in the use of force as an instrument of foreign policy is a mode of exerting restraint, one sanctioned by Nuremberg. Keeping governments within a framework of law, subject to interpretation by an independent judiciary, is also obviously relevant. Again demilitarizing priorities will be diverse, even contradictory, from setting to setting. For instance, the demilitarizing priority in South Africa may require Front Line states to augment their war-fighting capabilities in the short run, or a Third World beleaguered state such as post-1978 Nicaragua might do well to increase its defense budget as an inhibition against intervention.

As suggested, especially in anti-imperial contexts, certain apparent contradictions exist. Short-term belligerence may be required as a foundation for a more durable peace; at the extreme, additional proliferation of nuclear weapons capabilities may be a precondition for denuclearization.

Individual scale

What one does with one's own life is a primary political statement. The shift from militarized to demilitarized allegiances will be expressed, in the first instance, by what people do with their lives. Refusal by scientists and engineers to design weapons, or at least weapons related to mass destruction or offensive use, is one dimension; refusal to engage in secret research on security issues; tax refusal; draft resistance; more radical forms of civil disobedience—pouring blood on the gates of the Pentagon, blocking the completion of a Trident submarine base—illustrate the range of undertakings. Activities by professionals in the United States (Physicians for Social Responsibility; Lawyers Committee on Nuclear Policy) around the normative viability of nuclear war and weaponry are indicative of whole new dimensions of Third System activity.

In the liberal democracies, where citizens' rights are formally protected, the idea of a Nuremberg obligation to resist crimes of state is crucial. If individuals in sufficient number manifest this kind of higher loyalty, then a powerful movement against endowing governments with the option of discretionary violence and war-making will begin to take shape.

V. Conclusion

We need to monitor developments in the world from a demilitarizing perspective. This requires a sophisticated frame of reference, alive to struggles against domestic tyranny and injustice and against forms of imperialism, as well as preoccupied with the avoidance of warfare, especially beyond the nuclear

threshold. The tactics of demilitarization cannot normally—beyond the issue of nuclear weapons threat or use—be expressed in too universalistic terms. Finally, the First System seems generally implicated in the ongoing dynamics of militarization, the Second System seems stalemated by a tension between its impotence and its mandate, and the Third System, alone at present, seems able to sustain normative initiatives of consequence that move in a demilitarizing direction but not without a certain ambiguity, especially when its goals involve the seizure of political power, often entailing a new cycle of militarization.

FOOTNOTES

¹A fundamental distinction needs to be drawn between the United Nations Organization as *political actor* and the United Nations Charter as *political vision*. Only the Charter is consistently premised on world order values, and its vision has not been consistently or fully implemented in the life of the Organization, although the degree of realization has varied through time. For more on this see Falk, *A Global Approach to National Policy* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1975), Chapter 10.

²In some formulations, for instance that of the International Foundation for Development Alternatives (IFDA), the Second System is associated with the market and market forces such as corporations and banks, while all governmental institutions, including intergovernmental mechanisms—for instance, the United Nations—are assimilated into the First System. For world order purposes, however, the tripartite division of systems, as presented in the text, seems better adapted for inquiry and analysis.

³As for instance, advocated by Robert C. Johansen and Saul H. Mendlovitz, "The Role of Enforcement of Law on the Establishment of a New International Order: A Proposal for a Transnational Police Force, *Alternatives* VI, 2, 1980, pp. 307-37.

⁴For a fuller statement of this position, see Ali A. Mazrui, *The African Condition* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1980).

⁵*Disarmament for a Just World: Declaration of Principles, Proposal for a Treaty, and Call for Action*, issued on the occasion of the International Workshop on Disarmament, 27-31 March 1978, New Delhi. For text, see *Alternatives* IV, 1, 1978, pp. 155-160.

⁶*Declaration for a Just World: The Failure of Non-Proliferation*. Draft prepared by a group of concerned scholars to be presented at the Lisbon Conference of the World Order Models Project, 13-20 July 1980. The final text appears in *Alternatives*, VI, 3, 1980, pp. 491-96.

⁷For text of Rajgir Declaration see *Alternatives* VIII, 2, 1982.

WORLD ORDER MODELS PROJECT PUBLICATIONS

Book Series on Preferred Worlds for the 1990s

- Richard A. Falk, *A Study of Future Worlds* (\$15.00 hardcover, \$6.95 paper)
Johan Galtung, *The True Worlds* (\$17.95 hardcover, \$9.95 paper)
Rajni Kothari, *Footsteps into the Future: Diagnosis of the Present World and a Design for an Alternative* (\$8.95 hardcover, \$3.95 paper)
Gustavo Lagos and Horacio H. Godoy, *Revolution of Being: A Latin American View of the Future* (\$15.00 hardcover)
Ali A. Mazrui, *A World Federation of Cultures: An African Perspective* (\$14.95)
Saul H. Mendlovitz (ed.), *On the Creation of a Just World Order: Preferred Worlds for the 1990s* (\$9.95 hardcover, \$4.95 paper)

Working Paper Series

- Fouad Ajami, *Human Rights and World Order Politics* (\$2.00)
Lou Beres, *Nuclear Strategy and World Order: The U.S. Imperative* (\$2.00)
Graciela Chichilnisky, *Basic Needs and The North/South Debate* (\$2.00)
Cheryl Christensen, *Food Dependence or Independence* (\$2.00)
Cheryl Christensen, *The Right to Food: How to Guarantee* (2.00)
Richard A. Falk, *Normative Initiatives and Demilitarization: A Third System Approach* (\$2.00)
Richard A. Falk, *Nuclear Policy and World Order: Why Denuclearization* (\$2.00)
Richard A. Falk, *A World Order Perspective on Authoritarian Tendencies* (\$2.00)
Richard A. Falk and Samuel S. Kim, *An Approach to World Order Studies and the World System* (\$2.00)
Johan Galtung, *The North/South Debate: Technology, Basic Human Needs and the New International Economic Order* (\$2.00)
David Holloway, *War, Militarism and the Soviet State* (\$2.00)
Robert C. Johansen, *SALT II: Illusion and Reality* (\$2.00)
Robert C. Johansen, *Towards a Dependable Peace: A Proposal for an Appropriate Security System* (\$2.00)
Robert C. Johansen, *Toward an Alternative Security System* (\$2.00)
Gernot Kohler, *Global Apartheid* (\$2.00)
Rajni Kothari, *Environment and Alternative Development* (\$2.00)
Ali A. Mazrui, *The Barrel of the Gun and the Barrel of Oil in the North-South Equation* (\$2.00)
Ali A. Mazrui, *The Moving Cultural Frontier of World Order: From Monotheism to North-South Relations* (\$2.00)
Saul H. Mendlovitz, *Creating a Just World: Suggestions for an Agenda of Inquiry and Praxis for the 1980's* (\$2.00)
Yoshikazu Sakamoto, *Korea as a World Order Issue* (\$2.00)
R.B.J. Walker, *World Politics and Western Reason: Universalism, Pluralism, Hegemony* (\$2.00)

Periodical

Alternatives: A Journal of World Policy (Quarterly; \$15.00 per year for individuals; \$30.00 per year for libraries and institutions).

WOMP publications are available at the prices indicated from the Institute for World Order, 777 United Nations Plaza, New York, New York 10017. Bulk copies of the WOMP Working Papers are available at the following prices: 5-25 copies, \$1.50 each; 26 and over, \$1.00.

WORLD ORDER MODELS PROJECT

The World Order Models Project (WOMP) is a network of individuals and institutes throughout the globe engaged in research, education, dialogue, and action aimed at promoting a just world order. Over the next several years, WOMP will be 1) publishing and disseminating a series of Working Papers on the major global problems and issues facing the people of the planet; 2) sponsoring two task forces and publishing their respective reports on Demilitarization and People's Security and on Global Culture and an Evolving Just World Order; and 3) issuing and promoting policy statements on urgent world problems for consideration and action by concerned populist movements as well as by governmental and intergovernmental organizations.

Participating Institutes of the World Order Models Project

Centre for the Study of Developing Societies,
29, Rajpur Road, Delhi 110054, India

Department of Peace and Conflict Resolution
Lund University
Magle stora kyrkogata 12B
S-223- 50 Lund
Sweden

Institute for World Order
777 United Nations Plaza
New York, N.Y. 10017, U.S.A.

Synergic Developments, Associated with
Fundación Bariloche,
Casilla de Correo 138,
8400 San Carlos de Bariloche,
Province de Rio Negro
Argentina

World Order Studies Project,
Faculty of Law,
University of Tokyo, Hongo, Bunkyo-ku,
Tokyo 113, Japan

WORLD ORDER VALUES
PEACE.ECONOMIC WELL BEING.SOCIAL JUSTICE.ECOLOGICAL BALANCE

\$2.00